UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Personality and National Character - - - - - - - - - - *Bruno Lasker*

The Day Has Come - *Harold P. Marley*

American Policy Toward Russia - - - - - - - - - - - *Devere Allen*

The Problem of Anti-Semitism - *C. Sass*

Beginning of World Cooperation - - - - - - - - - - - *John A. Lester*

Kabir: The Apostle of Ecumenicity - - - - - - - - - - *Herbert H. Stroup*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 10

Chicago, December, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50
Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor of Worldover Press.

Bruno Lasker: Author, journalist, and now connected with the Southeast Asia Institute.

John A. Lester: Pennsylvania teacher and cooperative expert.

Harold P. Marley: Minister of the First Unitarian Church of Dayton, Ohio.

C. Sass: A resident of London, England.

Herbert H. Stroup: Professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 131

ARTICLES—
- Personality and National Character—BRUNO LASKER 132
- The Day Has Come—HAROLD P. MARLEY 135
- American Policy Toward Russia—DEVERE ALLEN 137
- The Problem of Anti-Semitism—C. SASS 138
- Beginning of World Cooperation—JOHN A. LESTER 139
- Kabir: The Apostle of Ecumenicity—HERBERT H. STROUP 140

POETRY—
- Admonition for Brotherhood—SJANNA SOLUM 136
- Glorified Peace—ANNE WILSON 140
- The Plague—SHELDON SHEPARD 142

THE STUDY TABLE—
- Unitarians on the March—RANDALL S. HILTON 141
- Things Eternal—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 141
- From Genealogy to History—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 141
- Book Notes—CURTIS W. REESE 142

CORRESPONDENCE—
- W.I.L. at Luxembourg—LYDIA G. WENTWORTH 143
- Harrington Replies to Editorial—DONALD HARRINGTON 143
- "Obvious Confusion"—HOMER A. JACK 143

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 144

THE FIELD—
- Bishop Oxnam Heads Planned Parenthood Committee 130

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Bishop Oxnam Heads Planned Parenthood Committee

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, has accepted chairmanship of a national committee to sponsor the First Nation-Wide Campaign for Planned Parenthood, it was announced recently by S. Rodger Callaway, chairman of the executive committee of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. The campaign will be held in February, 1947.

The campaign, with a goal of $2,000,000 for extension of planned parenthood services and for research in human fertility, will be held through 100 participating state and local committees of the Federation. It will be the first nation-wide campaign of the organization that was founded 26 years ago by Margaret Sanger as the American Birth Control League.

Bishop Oxnam has been closely identified with the field of education. Founder of the Church of All Nations in Los Angeles, he has also served on the faculties of the University of Southern California and Boston University School of Theology, and was president of DePauw University for eight years. He has been a Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church since 1936. He is married and has three children.

Bishop Oxnam was also among more than 3,200 members of the Protestant and Jewish clergy who recently signed a resolution calling for expansion of planned parenthood services in hospitals and social welfare agencies throughout the country.

"The services of planned parenthood—to enable parents to have wanted children by choice, instead of unwanted children by chance—is one of the most potent forces for our national well-being today," declared Bishop Oxnam in accepting campaign leadership, "and a vital factor in the protection of the home and the health of the family.

"Planned parenthood, which employs the best approved principles of child-spacing, saves lives and it saves homes."

Describing planned parenthood as "one expression of the Christian principle that affirms the sacredness of human personality," Bishop Oxnam said:

"Planned parenthood—designed to preserve the family, enrich the personality of the child and benefit society—rests upon firm moral foundations. The sin is in rejecting the means science makes available for this high purpose."

Mr. Callaway, who is chairman of the Planned Parenthood Federation's national campaign planning committee, said there are now 568 planned parenthood centers in the United States, and seven states offer child-spacing information as part of their public health services. The Federation's services embrace medically approved methods of contraception, treatment for childless couples, and education for marriage and parenthood.

UNITY

Volume CXXXII DECEMBER, 1946 No. 10

EDITORIAL

Being in a mood to give advice, I feel especially inclined to tell the Republican majority in the new Congress not what to do to save the country but what to do to win the 1948 election. No doubt the new majority in Congress has real concern for the country and I am positive it has grave concern for 1948. The sure way for the Republican majority in Congress to become the Republican Administration is to center attention on a few simple problems and solve them in a way that will catch the imagination of the people and win the confidence of independent liberals. This would not be difficult. There are issues that are made to order, and there are solutions that everybody can understand and that the vast majority would approve.

First, I strongly advise that the Republican majority vote solidly against seating "The Man" Bilbo. His loss to the Senate could not possibly do the Republican party any harm, and it would do the country much good. Besides ridding the Senate of a menace, such action could be used to glamorize the Republicans as the party of clean government and real democracy.

Second, I advise raising the income tax exemption in the lower brackets and, if necessary to secure sufficient revenue, raising the rate in the higher brackets. This would be sound in theory and it would lift a difficult burden from those who depend for their livelihood on an income level that is being constantly lowered by the mounting cost of living. Such action would publicize the Republicans as the party of the common people and answer the charge that it is an instrument of special privilege for entrenched interests.

Third, I advise the nationalization of the coal industry. In the present stage of fuel development, coal is essential to national prosperity. The present owners would be better off with government bonds that do not go on strike; and clipping coupons would require less effort than clipping the wings of John L. Lewis. The big industries would be glad to have their fuel supply stabilized. The miners would be more secure with government backing than with the uncertain backing of a tottering industry. The people in general would regard such action as evidence that America is not totally and finally committed to bucking world-wide trends towards experiments in socialization. And, furthermore, this would be the easiest way for the Republican party to reassert itself as the party of strong Federal action.

Fourth, I advise an international policy that irretrievably commits us to the use of every resource at our command—financial, industrial, scientific, and military—to make the United Nations work, and to underwrite democracy everywhere. We need the lift that would come from commitment to world goals; and the struggling peoples of the world need to feel that our mighty democratic power is on the world scene to stay.

There are other important issues with which the new congressional majority will have to deal but, depend on it, the 1948 election will be won or lost on these issues or on questions that these issues symbolize. An overly cautious policy will not do. Speedy, progressive action is called for and if it is forthcoming the 1948 election is in the bag. If, on the other hand, reactionary Republicans join forces with reactionary Democrats, then 1948 is anybody's guess; and my guess is that the progressive and liberal forces of all parties will again join forces as they did under Franklin Delano Roosevelt and sweep reaction from the national political scene.

This advice is free, but Republicans will disregard it at their peril.

Curtis W. Reese.

Personality and National Character

BRUNO LASKER

Every now and then, writers who should know better try to explain some outstanding political or literary figure with "national character." This would be a harmless amusement were it not for the contagious effect upon social attitudes of false identifications of personality traits with imaginary "innate" traits of races and nationalities. It is easy to recognize the unfairness of the stereotyped ethnic picture created by such identification when it becomes the pretext for denying the members of a subject population group the educational advantages to which they are entitled by individual character and attainment. A spurious biological argument is used when it is argued that this Malay or that Negro cannot benefit from the professional training which he seeks because his racial heritage will never permit him to attain the talents necessary for the career to which that training is supposed to lead.

The harm done to social thinking is much less obvious when superior racial traits are attributed to individuals without examination as to their actual possession of these traits. For example, the whole world has been misled by writers who pictured all of the German people as genetically the heirs of Immanuel Kant, of Johann Sebastian Bach, and of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. A correct analysis of the German national character in recent times would emphasize the thoroughness with which Prussian militarism and bureaucracy have stamped upon the German people, with all their racial diversity, a psychology far different from that of any one of those great masters. It was of no advantage to them or to the world that they should be mistaken for a people of thinkers and artists when that attribute which more than any other distinguished them from their neighbors was that they had become habituated to the acceptance of authority with all the concommitants of such submission: servility and fear among the inferiors, arrogance and cruelty among those possessed of power. But even that generalization must not be carried too far. It obviously does not help to explain a Thomas Mann or a Hindemith or a Wolfgang Koehler; nor does it say anything even approximately true of the typical immigrant to America from rural Wuerttemberg or Baden, who either escaped before the conditioning of youth had reached its full effectiveness, or have had time to modify their attitudes in the fresh breeze of Western freedom.

Goethe was venerated by Germans during the era of the Hohenzollern empire (the former rulers of that dynasty detested him). But it was especially during the brief interlude of the Weimar Republic that his popular appreciation came to vie that of his much more widely read contemporary, Schiller. Yet, it would be difficult to think of a German writer less representative of anything that might be called the national character. His universality of interests, his genuine love of the classics, his clarity of thought and expression, and his practical ability in the application of science, all set him far apart from the more typical "great" men of his time.

If Cervantes is "Spanish to his finger tips," then everything we know of Spanish character and temperament, as manifested through five centuries of modern history, makes little sense. Carlyle is not the Scotsman of picture or story. And if either Swinburne or Kipling is proclaimed as typically English, then the other is *eo ipso* un-English, for there is hardly a greater contrast in modern literature. Genius never is representative of national character.

Most of all, the student of this subject is staggered if he is invited to think of Jesus as a Jew. The Nazarene simply does not fit into the concept of any national prototype. Whether genealogically traced to the House of David or given a human ancestry that would attribute his genes to some stock of the Aryan language group, whether we accept his picture as drawn in the Gospels or one filled in with borrowings from a wider range of historical records, he stands alone, *solus sui generis.*

It is not a failure of imagination or lack of knowledge that has given the portrait of Jesus so great a variety in the art of the Middle Ages and of the Renaissance. The Italian and Spanish, Flemish, French, German, and Dutch painters were not unfamiliar with Near Eastern types. They took evident pleasure in depicting Kaspar, one of the Three Kings, as an African. But Jesus they painted in the image of one they loved. The writer here must confess that, through the accident of his personal experiences in early manhood, Jesus seems to him to have most in common with the Irish. The explanation does not lie in the similarity of fate suffered by the Irish in their subjection by Great Britain, and by the Jews in their subjection by Rome. It is rather that the figure of Jesus somewhat resembles that of a few very exceptional Irishmen who flourished in the first decade of this century and whose names, to avoid odious comparisons, will not be divulged. As a matter of fact, it was not the Irishman George Moore but the American Upton Sinclair who first made Jesus' walk on earth somewhat understandable to the writer of this article. Perhaps this is because *They Call Me Carpenter,* with all its respect for the unique genius of the Nazarene, presents a personage resembling the best of men whom anyone could be privileged to meet in our time—anyone, that is, who has lived among simple and guileless people without being altogether shut out from the society of thinkers and artists. (As a matter of fact, several of the workingmen whom the writer knew well in his impressionable years were poets and had other unusual gifts for making life beautiful. Except for a few artists, a teacher or two, and some missionaries in distant lands, whose devotion to creative tasks was equally inspiring, he has never had occasion to revise his estimate.)

There certainly was not in Jesus, as he emerges from the Gospels, the cold intellectuality of the Jewish scholar or the pale mysticism of the Cabalist. He was a true teacher—one is tempted to say, a born pedagogue —and a seer. But it was his profound knowledge of human nature that made him the one, and his exultant vision that made him the other. He was the master of symbolism. His imagination, as in the parable of the Good Samaritan, produced scenes which everybody could visualize and understand. His romanticism was tinged with humor, his occasional satire with kindness. He had an apt word for everyone—not like a politician who merely desires to please but as one who sought to draw the best out of each individual according to his state and ability. He appealed to that which was

noble in the humblest of men, when merely to preach nobility as a goal would have been futile. He was a revolutionary whose mind was so filled with love that there was no place for hatred, so focussed upon the Kingdom of God that even men favored in the ungodly society of his time sought him out so that they might learn how true happiness might be found.

If I have glimpsed a faintly similar combination of qualities in some of the Irish poets, statesmen, and labor leaders of thirty or forty years ago, it nevertheless did not occur to me to place them on the same exalted level. They were less single-minded in their devotion to high purpose, their spirit at times was tinged with quite earthy emotions and appetites. But in some of these men I found something which, to my mind, is characteristic of Jesus, the man—something which, for reasons easy to see, the Christian Church has never stressed: a humorous self-deprecation which occasionally also takes the form of whimsical self-glorification. It is interesting to note that the most recent biographer of Jesus, Robert Graves, has been so misled by this trait as to assume for him an actual kinship with King Herod. Without this sense of humor which made Jesus a favored guest at banquets and the beloved companion of the poor, he would have been too remote to gain the devotion of so diverse a circle of followers. He longed for complete immersion in the crystal pool of wisdom, but he was not above desire for a little of that peace and freedom which all men seek. Essentially an aristocrat in feeling—as pastoral people so often are—he became the greatest democrat of all times. To judge from the effect which he produced, he knew how to tell a story that made men laugh and women weep. Yet, there is no direct record of Jesus as a diffuser of cheerfulness or sentiment, because institutional tradition and self-interest has embalmed his biography in an absurd solemnity.

A life devoted to battle for the supreme human cause cannot but have often been melancholy. A poet and prophet cannot escape the weight of an almost unbearable responsibility. But every creative genius, even a hell-facing Dante and a tormented Beethoven, is able at times to communicate to others that inner security and harmony which expresses itself in playful joviality. The great storyteller is not a forbidding Sir Oracle who disguises his lofty purpose and deliberately caters for the acclaim of his hearers; his most glorious hours are those in which service becomes fellowship and exaltation assumes the lightness of shared joy. One likes to think of Jesus in those hours as the seer who has shed the saffron robe and stands among his comrades as one of them, though the most gifted; the fighter who has cast off his arms to relax, knowing in his heart that victory is sure.

No man with such a talent for self-forgetfulness belongs to one race, one nation, or one class. Wherever he may be, whatever his worldly circumstances, he belongs to all humanity. There have been great statesmen, like Abraham Lincoln, who have had something of this quality; there have been poets like Robert Burns and painters like Filippo Lippi, who are universally loved by those who know their work because, in a medium not too difficult to understand, they reassure the individual of his belonging to a larger and more meaningful company than that of his immediate associates.

When I visualize the Nazarene as resembling an Irish poet or labor organizer—not necessarily in Ireland, but perhaps in Lancashire or in New England—I see his followers as more or less typical victims of social suppression. Infinitely more capable than their education and status permitted them to show, they responded to the leadership of one who knew their secret even though they might not always understand his "ideology." For, in his more exalted moments, Jesus sometimes went far beyond their limited power of comprehension. They loved him as a small boy loves his elder brother: for his strength and ready hand, for his ability to expound their pain and frustration as they could not themselves, above all for the sincerity with which when the need arose he threw his lot in with theirs. They knew of the sacrifices he made even for those of them who had no claim on him. And since he called on them to make similar sacrifices, they did not hold against him his obvious moral superiority. He taught them how to enjoy life and how to laugh at disappointment. They loved him for holding a consistent striving for righteousness more precious than any particular heroic achievement, for lifting them to the level of their own best, and for doing this without making them feel uneasy under a burden of too much sanctity. These artisans and fishermen, shepherds and small tradesmen, innkeepers and minor officials liked to remain on the solid earth and would have had little use for a teacher who wanted to change them into harp-playing angels overnight. Here was a leader who enriched their stake in life without forcing them to abandon their easy speech and simple habits.

Thus, a great labor leader of our time, or the inspired leader of an ethnic minority, makes common men realize their personal importance in the scheme of human progress, and at the same time does not permit them to acquire the bigotry of self-appointed saints. There was nothing bumptious or hypocritical about Peter, John, or the rest of the disciples. Even Judas was a confused soul who thought he was doing right in helping to do away with a leader whose recent utterances seemed to endanger the common cause. They all knew themselves as pioneers of a new social order as well as of a religious reformation; as far as they were concerned, comradeship was the essential bond without which they could not hope to attain that even greater bond which each of them desired — between himself and God. Greatly as so many biographers of Jesus—Santayana, Simkhovitch, and Schweitzer among the more recent—have contributed to our understanding of this greatest of historical figures, we can evaluate the quality of his leadership only through the reconstruction of a dynamic group process, perhaps with some such methods as the *Gestalt* psychologists are even now perfecting.

We also need, of course, the insights afforded by other disciplines, and especially those of social history. Jesus somewhat resembled some of the best Irish leaders of recent times in his pronounced feeling for the national past—not as a starting point for the revival of an exclusively national culture, but as the most available resource in the pursuit of universal values. Keltic and Jewish lore alike abound in treasures of the human spirit that help to keep men modest in their contemplation of their own attainments. Handed on from generation to generation, such a lore becomes symbolical for feelings too deep for adequate transmission in the vernacular of everyday intercourse. It was the special genius of Jesus among the great religious teachers of

all ages to combine these reminders, in their formal scriptural embodiment, with wisdom drawn from contemporary experience. So, in our time, too, and not least in Ireland, the most compelling literature of humanistic religion is that which uses both the familiar symbols and the unpretentious "annals of the poor."

Biblical commentators, in their eagerness to point every moral and to underline the universality of Christian teaching, sometimes expound the parables of Jesus as though they were mere circumlocutions: deliberate evasions of straight answers to straight questions about God and eternity and the way of salvation. Actually, they are stories of personal experiences, told with extraordinary economy of words and dramatic effect. In no other way could the simple villagers to whom they were addressed have been helped to realize the meaning for them, in their own perplexities, of old prescripts which the passage of time with its corroding effect on the vernacular had made all but incomprehensible. They appeal to the common sense of the hearers as well as to their respect for ancient authority. They give the answers as directly as the circumstances permit. Why, men have always asked and still ask, should we accept the old laws as binding on ourselves? Have not times changed? Is not the good of one generation often the bane of another? Abraham was a worthy man, to be sure; but a code of morals that benefited the members of a wandering tribe of herdsmen surely is not suited to the circumstances of our little fishing village or of the neighborhoods in our great city where the artisans dwell and try to sell their wares?

Morality is inescapably linked with the problems of here and now. True, men will err if they discard the wisdom of their ancient sages without at least examining its relevance to their own problems. But are they not even more likely to go to destruction if they blindly accept the sanction of traditional authority? A catechism that merely restates in the words of the present day what the Old Book says about virtue and sin is not enough to satisfy the doubter. But he will not for long be happy either to obey precepts drawn exclusively from recent observation and proclaimed or adumbrated by teachers whose authority has not yet been tested by age-long experience. (Some recent discussions of moral problems resemble those books of etiquette which in each new edition proclaim as sanctioned those usages which have recently been observed in good society.)

When we read the great religious books of some alien culture, such as the Koran or the Vedanta, we are only too well aware of the difficulty posed for our understanding by lofty generalizations when we do not know out of what concrete situations they have sprung, and out of what tribulations of ordinary men and women in a society unlike our own. This is true also of less venerable documents which attempt to lay down, in the legislator's pungent language, those "eternal verities" by which a society or a nation, a religious order, or an institution hopes to insure its survival. A single example of recent times must suffice to illustrate the tendency of a document, intended to transmit a charge which men had sealed with their blood, to change into a pale abstraction the meaning of which can be interpreted in many ways.

The Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted in 1869, after a war that had touched every home in the land, expressed a principle which for the framers had the vitality of a great resolution. It is true, they were content to propound a principle, as their forefathers in 1783 and 1788 had propounded other principles that were to govern American life, and did not at once proceed to the framing of laws that could in practice be enforced. But if the Fifteenth Amendment has any meaning at all, it is that differences in race shall henceforth have no part in determining who can exercise the suffrage. The Amendment subsequently has been debated and fought over many times—each time losing more of its luster, especially when the Supreme Court itself placed obstacles in the way of its realization. Does this mean that the Amendment has no value for us and for those who come after us? Is it mere verbiage? By no means. It remains a great historical gesture, a symbol of intent to be followed by action, the statement of an American ideal that still is held by the overwhelming majority of the people. But it would be dead and useless as a moral invocative if we who believe in it were to cease agitating in behalf of its accomplishment. And that agitation can take only one effective form: the demonstration, as occasion arises, of how unfair it is in concrete situations—such as the taxation of Negroes for public expenditures which, deprived of the vote, they are prevented from sharing—to withhold the suffrage from a large part of the population on racial grounds. Were it not for the repeated appeal to the principle of the Amendment in the ever-shifting concrete demands of social justice, it would be no more today than an archaic formula, buried in the archives of a people that does not know its own mind. Eventually a situation will arise which will make it imperative for the peace of the nation to translate that token of its purpose into a law that is enforceable with the available instruments of administration.

It may be said that it is an American characteristic, explainable on historical grounds, to be moved in crises by humanitarian sentiments but to rely in everyday life on the pragmatic sanction of the short-term business principle of compromise. Jesus was "Irish"—in a special sense of the word—in that he took his faith more seriously than the possibility of any immediate accomplishment. That, of course, is true of all great religionists and marks them off from their fellows who are weighed down by matters of consequence for themselves, their families, and their friends. But few men ever have shown that humility, so different from a condescending self-abasement, which enhanced the nobility of one who felt himself wholly possessed by and at one with God. The entrance into Jerusalem on the back of an ass was a mock parade—perhaps a publicity stunt thought of, we do not know by whom—which Jesus and those who shared his modesty of disposition never dreamed would be taken seriously as a claim to royal rank. "Don't be an idiot," one almost hears Jesus say, when he is asked whether he is the announced King of Judaea. Yet, when the comedy turns into tragedy, he plays his part to the bitter end. The need for improvisation is turned into the greatest opportunity to dramatize the essence of his teaching. "Let me be your king then," he says in effect, "and I will show you what kingship means." At the last, deep conviction and poetic imagination merge in the most moving incident of all time. Highest truth compels the prophet to accept a destiny beyond human endurance. He ends his life in an act inconceivably more heroic than anyone could have dared to plan. He now knows himself the veritable Son of God, who must

let no weakness mar that sublime moment when by the manner of his dying he can give proof to generations yet unborn of their kinship with the divine.

Thus Jesus, whatever his earthly Father's origin, was no Jew. His personality became part of that composite ideal man which every nationality, every ethnic group, considers essentially its own. The art and the poetry, above all the folklore, of many centuries have not so much made a universal figure of Jesus of Nazareth—for he was that even while he lived—but a figure which in different lights reflects the longing of different societies and social classes. To us of this generation, he appeals more especially as the son of a carpenter, who never betrayed his comrades or became impatient with their shortcomings, who identified himself with the poor and solaced the oppressed with the prospect of deliverance, who cured the sick with the strength of his faith and raised the spiritually dead to new life. Perturbed by men's mastery over instruments of destruction to which nothing as yet corresponds in their mastery over their own emotions, we once again turn our eyes to the supreme teacher of mutual forgiveness and peace.

So, to a lesser degree and within far narrower scope, the greatest of living men cannot be claimed as representative of a race, a nation, or a class. They are kin of men of many stocks, languages, and climes, to the extent to which their genius makes them immortal. For, genius is superior to character, which is limited by birth and milieu, by chance and circumstance. Its quintessence is a personality which, rooted in the earth, flowers under the benign blessing of heaven above.

The Day Has Come

HAROLD P. MARLEY

On a monument in Waldheim Cemetery in Chicago are the words: "The day will come when our silence will be more powerful than the voices you are throttling today." This challenge was spoken distinctly by August Spies through the hangman's hood just before he "dropped into eternity," as the newspaper patronizingly put it. In a common grave with three others who were executed that November day, their "silence" is becoming audible.

That was exactly sixty years ago, but today the American public is reading about the Haymarket affair to the tune of a million copies through the pen of Howard Fast, and the life of Peter B. Altgeld which is restored in a biographic-fiction sketch in the book, *The American*. Judge Peter Altgeld learns through a mutual friend, George A. Schilling, all about Albert Parsons. one of the throttled voices whose last words were cut off just as he began: "Let the voice of the people be heard. . . ." He discovers that this beloved labor leader was more interested in ideas than bombs; was poor in worldly goods, but rich in his devotion to family and the working man; and voluntarily entered the courtroom to join the others who were being tried, not for bomb-throwing, but for "inciting to violence." Even after the foreordained conviction, he might have saved his life along with the two whose sentences were commuted, had he been willing to make the appeal to Governor Oglesby, but, like a Tom Mooney, he would accept nothing less than a full pardon.

The day came six years later when the men in Joliet were given a full pardon by the man in the Governor's chair in Springfield, a man who had been elected, for one reason, because he promised a full investigation of the whole Haymarket happening. The Altgeld study was so exhaustive that he not only pardoned the men, but he condemned the court whose legal farce had convicted them. The fanatical flood of criticism unsheathed against his act was said to spell his political doom. But it also gave the friends of justice an opportunity to once more express themselves. However, the people soon forget their martyrs. Only the voice of Albert Parsons was kept alive by his devoted widow who never once relaxed her efforts, at street-corner bookstalls and in labor hall harangues, to clear the name of her husband who had died as a common malefactor.

Many of the labor leaders of that day were not only radicals, but they were foreigners—"imbecile, foreign fanatics," as the *Chicago Tribune* charged. Parsons was not. Altgeld just missed native birth by weeks, and as a consequence lost what would have been an assured nomination for President on the Democratic ticket. Both men followed the good old American tradition of starting with nothing, following the harvest, and "workin' on the Railroad." A definition of Americanism is suggested by Fast when he has Altgeld say to a bored judge before whom he is arguing an injunction case:

> This is my land, it has been so for as long as I can remember, and I think it will be so for whatever time is left me. It is my land because it made me, it shaped me, it nourished me. The thoughts I think came from this land, and the dreams I dream came from this land.

It happened in the story that the ex-Governor said this on the very day he died. It is only a way of saying that left-wingers come by their radicalism honestly —so do all people. There is no point in identifying Americanism with the shade of belief a certain critic may hold at one particular moment in history.

The day has come in 1946 which reproduces all the hysteria of 1886, and makes the Howard Fast book as timely as one by H. G. Wells. Again, people are laying exaggerated claims to a monopoly in Americanism and passing easy judgments upon their neighbors. All about us are strikes and rumors of strikes "caused by Communist infiltration." Today we have the same newspaper campaign to discredit the liberal spirit in labor and in politics, by using the very same device. Then, all who professed unusual ideas were categorized as Communists, though there was no such party or movement in existence. There was no attempt to meet the spokesmen for labor on the level of argument; only abuse and industrial lockouts. Several hours before the gas-pipe bomb took the life of a single policeman (others died later) a meeting of manufacturers was held in a Chicago hotel which voted to close down their factories until "the men shall agree to work a full ten-hour day."

When a worker carried a sign "Down with Capitalism" the papers spoke of the "lurid banners and mottos of Communism." As to the orderly march to Lakeside Park on May Day, the first celebration of its kind ever

held, the *Tribune* reported that "the district was paraded by a rabble of imbecile, foreign fanatics." If there was a strike, and they were legion, it was due to "the instigation of a Communist walking delegate." A scapegoat then was Jefferson Davis, who was staging a personal comeback; now it is Henry Wallace. Yes, it is all here again, all but the explosion of a suitcase atom bomb on Wall Street.

With the significant stirring of old voices today through new organizations of labor and Socialist governments abroad, the campaign is in full swing to "clean the Communists out" and to "get tough with Russia." Just as Chicago was the storm center then, it is again rising to the emergency of saving the day. Smarting under the spectacle of Sewell Avery being carried out of his own office by United States troopers, it has unleashed in the *Chicago Journal of Commerce,* a series of red-baiting articles by Andrew Avery (not a relative) which receive front-page publicity all over the land. Chicago, the home of America First, the hub of Elizabeth Dilling's *Red Network,* the scene of a Decoration Day massacre at the Republic Steel Company, the place of machine politics and spectacular crime—this Chicago is the Salem of modern witch-hunting.

There is a description in *Under Cover* of an organization across the street from the Chicago F.B.I. office, presided over by George Washington Robnett who feasted upon the fears of industrialists. Mr. Robnett is still acting as a minute man to warn his countrymen, "the Communists are coming," and proudly points to his cross-indexed files and imagines himself as the right bower of the Wood-Rankin committee on un-American activities. He feeds his "evidence" to the credulous in a mimeographed sheet under the masthead, of all things, "The Statue of Liberty." Chicago can at least take credit for doing things in the open, with a bluster not unlike the cold lake wind which has given her a name. There was no Black Legion in the thirties such as Detroit developed to eliminate labor radicals without trial, and the jury which acquitted Samuel Insull was just as open and unanimous as the one which convicted Spies, Parsons, and the six others. It may even be imagined that Sewell Avery is the innocent victim of this Chicago brashness, which, without consulting Governor Altgeld, persuaded President Cleveland to send Federal troops to help the Pinkerton police break the famous Pullman strike. Mr. Avery is today a director of the Pullman company.

The silence of the grave was broken briefly in 1926 when Sigmund Zeisler read a paper before the Chicago Literary Club. Describing himself as the sole survivor of the principals of the Haymarket drama, this attorney for the Defense gave a complete and orderly account of his recollections. He showed how the popular hysteria prevented a fair trial, though the Supreme Court upheld it. E. S. Dreyer, a personal enemy of Spies, later changed his mind. Zeisler recounted a strange visit to his office of the brother-in-law of Schwab the morning after, and intimates that he may have been the guilty person. Mayor Harrison attended most of the Haymarket meeting, then went to the Desplaines police station and advised that the police reserves be sent home.

The real break in the silence is happening today with the mounting circulation of a book which would make a Hollywood thriller if producers would extricate themselves from the medieval tradition for this most modern of arts. Howard Fast never went to college, but he writes with erudition and conviction of this crisis—the fourth crisis in American history with which he has concerned himself. Of his book, he says "I could not keep from writing it, because it was a weight on my conscience for more than five years . . . because in these times it is necessary for memories of men like Altgeld to come alive." He has brought to the mind of a generation which remembers the Sacco-Vanzetti case, its Haymarket progenitor, which makes the 1927 version of legal killing seem almost an anti-climax.

My visit to Waldheim was one of the thousands of pilgrimages made there every year. I discovered that buried there are not only four hanged men and a "suicide" (Fast intimates that Lingg may have been beaten to death in his cell), but the ashes of the three pardoned men have since been added. Appropriate, too, is the marker of the half-Indian Lucy Parsons who died in 1942. Surmounting the grave is a twelve-foot stone shaft with a symbolic figure of Freedom placing a wreath on the crumpled figure of a bewhiskered, idealized man. The plot is maintained by the Pioneer Aid Society, but there is something there which needs no maintenance. This is the great principle that "truth crushed to earth shall rise again."

On nearby plots are graves of other liberty lovers, including Emma Goldman, who have gravitated that way in death. I read these inscriptions on the other stones:

A life dedicated to Human Freedom.
Liberty was Life—Liberty in thought, word and deed.
Liberty will not descend to a People, a People must raise themselves to Liberty.

Had I been able to express my feelings, I would have changed one word in the traditional cemetery cliché, "Here sleep the dead," for here the dead do not "sleep"—they speak.

Admonition for Brotherhood

What matters the indeterminate hair,
The eyes, the voice, the skin they wear,
The alien externals there?

Why is it we must always see
The superficiality
Of others, as they seem to be?

If the mechanics of the brain
With honesty were all made plain,
Would not alone we entertain

Compassion? If the secrets hid
Behind the bland eye's winking lid
Reveal themselves, would not we bid

The striving one to ease his yoke
Upon our shoulders, and evoke
A tenderness at single stroke?

Cannot we read the secret signs
Of brotherhood in all blue lines
Of veins? The inner man defines

His imprint on the outer clay
But dimly, in a cautious way;
Still, there should be no least delay

Of recognition in the heart
That all are one, and one a part
Of all. Let recognition start.

SJANNA SOLUM.

American Policy Toward Russia

DEVERE ALLEN

A policy toward Russia, neither threat nor appeasement, is the crucial need of American diplomacy—a policy which aims neither to satisfy those who think Russia invariably right, nor those who hate Russian achievements fully as much as Soviet expansionism. For consideration and criticism I suggest:

1. Firmly oppose, with better counter-propositions, every step by Russia which violates international order, subordinates small nations to big-power dominance, breaks pledges, or endangers peace.

2. Renounce, by acts as well as words, every imperialistic ambition of our own, offering to place under wide trusteeship those coveted overseas bases. Disavow government support for U.S. commercial enterprises abroad that resist regulation or nationalization, even when offered adequate indemnity. Junk hemisphere defense plans of a military character in favor of inter-American cultural cooperation.

3. Encourage British desires to abandon the old imperialism by helping her achieve security in the Near East and Mediterranean without heavily fortified outposts closer to Russia than to Britain. These steps might help: internationalize both Russian and British bases in the Black Sea and the Mediterranean; if that is impossible, then support a demilitarized, internationalized Dardanelles, plus a Turkish-Soviet pact permitting Turkey to close the Straits in wartime against all enemies of Russia. Ask Russia, in turn, to guarantee non-interference in peacetime with Britain's vital oil supplies, so essential for overseas commerce and home industry.

4. Forego the practice of showing firm resistance to Soviet expansionism by sending warships into controversial zones. We never send enough to prevent aggression, but enough to provoke resentment, not only in Russia, but in countries we need to win. Examples: the *Roosevelt* in Greece, the *Missouri* in Turkey, the arrival of a United States fleet at Lisbon simultaneously with our request for Portuguese bases.

5. Even if Russia also plays ball with known Fascists, give up, on principle, all coddling of Franco and other reactionary dictators, making clear to the world that we have no intention of erecting strongholds against Communism by using dictators who are hostile to Moscow chiefly for wrong reasons.

6. Use as a consistent test of Russian policies their fitness for the development of a peaceable world community, not their suitability for American aggrandizement and prestige.

7. Destroy at once all stockpiles of atom bombs, and cease their manufacture, inviting international observers now to inspect the genuineness of our action, but without granting access to secret processes. Agree forthwith to the Soviet proposal for the outlawry of such weapons, even if convinced that no adequate policy stops there. Continue, in this improved moral position, to work patiently but firmly for worldwide inspection of uranium sources and atomic energy plants.

8. Issue a call for an immediate disarmament conference, but, if Russian recalcitrance makes that impossible, try to get agreement for a conference to take place at once upon the drafting of the postwar treaties of settlement. Accompany the call with a pledge to cut armament to as low a level as that of any other major power. Because gun length, numbers of planes, etc., are irrelevant standards compared to strategic safety, industrial potential, etc., a quota principle may be necessary for the first decade, but even now a long-term disarmament program should be offered.

9. Accompany the making of all agreements with Russia, by ourselves alone or in world conference, with diplomatic consultation to fix the meaning and interpretation of the wording as understood by all parties. Often, agreements are said to be broken, on both sides, because words are differently interpreted; and yet words frequently cannot convey identical meaning in different languages or different countries.

10. Drop the use of recognition as a diplomatic weapon, unilaterally, substituting the Estrada doctrine of automatic recognition of stable governments, without approval or disapproval. Take the correction and prevention of cruel encroachments on human rights neither into our own hands nor those alone of the Big Three, but to the United Nations. Adhere to the policy of extending relief to desperate, suffering peoples whether or not we like the regimes under which they live. Example: the reported refusal of British authorities to ship penicillin to Russia or Russian-dominated areas is precisely the way not to proceed.

11. Extend Russia material cooperation in her struggle to repair her terrible war damage, by offering a large credit for non-military machines, to be sent as fast as they can be spared, for farm and industrial rehabilitation. Treat her unfortunate looting of machinery from occupied regions as an unapproved, but understandable, shellshock, seeking to make it unnecessary hereafter by offering new, modern machinery. Appoint a new ambassador to Moscow, not on idealogical lines at all, but for his proficiency as a technical adviser in making the most of our aid—if accepted—for the raising of Russian living standards.

12. Until the "iron curtain" is lifted set up a non-governmental commission of objective Americans to sift and publicize all findings, bad and good, about actual conditions in Soviet territory. Religious and labor delegations have gone freely into Russia, but who reads their reports? Take the testimony of returned relief, business, labor, religious, and technical agents recently inside the "curtain." Example: a report reaching the writer from Hungary contradicts most, and says: "Russian soldiers are kindly, simple, childlike, commit no cruelties, try to help the people!" Soft, credulous, false, or partly true? Who knows?

13. Invite to the United States, and tour them widely, all sorts of artistic, musical, and sport groups from Russia, hoping for reciprocity but not insisting on it, and not ceasing if at first rebuffed. The Swedes are now doing this, with a certain useful easing of tension. Can it hurt us?

You may reply that all this is a sissy program, not consistent with American dignity and world prestige. To which I retort: Keep right on as we are and see where it gets us.

The Problem of Anti-Semitism

C. SASS

During the recent war I had many opportunities of discussing post-war problems, and especially those of Europe. There was much idle speculation, with many ifs and buts. In one respect, however, there was almost no speculation at all,—when the discussions touched the question of what would happen to the Jews after the war. A number of fixed ideas dominated almost all who were interested in this problem.

Kind-hearted Britishers used to console the distressed Jews, whose brethren were put to death in masses in every possible way. The first thing to do, they said, was to defeat the enemy. Then among all other peoples the Jews, too, would be liberated,— if they had somehow escaped the torture and gas chambers. There would be a paradise on earth. It would be so brilliant a time that nobody would even think of Palestine or any other emigration. There would be much enthusiasm due to the defeat of Hitler, and out of sheer gratitude and love the Jews would strain the remnants of their strength and devote them to the rebuilding of the beloved and glorious European countries.

Anti-Nazis from Austria and Germany, and left-wing Poles had different ideas about this problem. They insisted that there is no such thing as a Jewish people. Hitler had invented the idea in order to build up his criminal Fascism. Owing to the economic distress prevailing everywhere, this could be achieved. With the defeat of Hitler a miraculous economic policy, tried and experienced in Soviet Russia, would lay the foundation for a new economic life in Europe. When the stomachs of the peoples are satisfied, anti-Semitism would disappear by itself. All those whom Fascists, anti-democrats and reactionaries consider as Jews would enjoy a new paradise never experienced before.

Other groups, such as the liberals, the religious, the cosmopolitans had more or less similar and hopeful ideas. Strangely enough, an undertone accompanied these otherwise well-meaning ideas, which was not actually outspoken—namely, that the Jews would become reasonable and adaptable.

Now, let us be frank with all those friends of humane treatment of men. Do they really think that the tragedy of the Jews, and consequently that of the non-Jews, is in any way connected with the activities or behavior of the Jews? If so, these people have not learned the lesson of the last decade. Do these people know that the concentration camps were especially for those Jews who had excellent records? Jewish criminals were far better treated even under Hitler. They were brought to the ordinary courts and sentenced in the ordinary way.

There are Jewish capitalists and Communists, democrats and reactionaries, religious men and atheists, just as there are among any other people. It is impossible to have all Jews completely of one category or another. If this justifies intolerance, anti-social activities, murder, or robbery, then it cannot be helped. Using a New Testament phrase, I would say whichever people has not these varieties may throw the first stone at the Jews. Either people will learn to be tolerant, or they will excuse any wickedness to which they incline.

The alleged shortcomings associated with the Jews have nothing exclusively to do with the Jews. If there were no Jews, some substitute would be invented. The only particular connection these charges have with the Jews is that the Jews have always to pay first with their health, wealth, security, and life for the mental disease called anti-Semitism.

The word Jew has the effect of a red rag in front of an enraged bull. The rag, we know, is entirely harmless. Everybody with healthy senses can see thousands of them and not get excited at all. But a bull hardly sees a red rag and his frenzy knows no limits. It is a tragedy that the Jews are always the first, if not the only, victims of an anti-Semitic avalanche. They cannot defend themselves. They are powerless. They are outnumbered and disarmed by numerous well-armed foes.

It is fallacious to point only at Germany. We need to remind ourselves of the pre-revolutionary Russia, the Russia of Peljura, Denikin, Wrangel. Was Poland between 1918-1939 different? Were Hungary, Rumania, Austria different? It would also be fallacious to conclude that all the people anywhere are infected with this disease. There were many Germans, even under Hitler, who were sane. So it was among all European peoples. But we notice that the overwhelming majorities of all the peoples are—to put it mildly—not disinclined to such an infection. Some may consider it wiser to conceal the infection, some are ashamed of it. Others may fight honestly against it, try to immunize themselves, but the fundamental inclination exists. And those who purposely foster and cultivate this madness, at a time when other mental illnesses are being treated with great care, consider it as good business with no risk and sure gain. They know very well that the Jews cannot help themselves. These people need not be anti-Semites themselves. They use anti-Semitism for politico-strategical purposes. This was the basis of Hitler's fanatical Jew-hatred. One of the greatest present-day anti-Semites, Douglas Reed, in his desire to praise Otto Strasser had no other recommendation for him than that Strasser was a real anti-Semite, whereas Hitler was not a proper anti-Semite. I think that such honorable "gentlemen" as Father Coughlin and his ilk need not be either. They may be Jew-mad but they need not be. They have quite different ambitions, and they think that propaganda for plundering, murdering, and humiliating Jews can help them achieve their aims. The ambition may be personal or institutional, but has nothing to do with the human quality of the Jews. Surely the elimination of a number of Jews from certain economic, social, or cultural positions is too small a goal even for the anti-Semite, who is usually not blessed with too much intelligence. It is simply not worth all the trouble that they take—the immense effort to mobilize millions, to inspire them with fanatical zeal, irrational hatred, to spread these efforts over tens and hundreds of millions—against a handful of Jews.

We have to take the facts as they are. There are Jew-mad people among all peoples on earth. There are people whose mental predisposition inclines them this way. There are others who consider the existence of the Jew as a grace of God, since the Jew can facilitate their covert grasp for money and power. This is quite

simple. It is illegal to steal or murder in a modern community. A decent fellow may have to work very hard, and even then it is doubtful whether he can achieve as much power and wealth as he would like. But if anti-Semitism is successful, how easy it is to get the things one desires. There are those also who think it is not worth-while to bother about the childish anti-Semites; and they are not interested in Jews either. As long as there is no pogrom there is no necessity to worry about them, and when there is a pogrom, well, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

We sometimes hear the allegation of cowardice against the Jews, because they do not defend themselves when attacked by the anti-Semitic hordes. This sounds particularly strange. The hooligans attack Jews only when they are sure of success; that is, when the Jews are defenseless and their attackers well-armed and immensely superior in number. Is there any country that allows the Jews to organize for self-defense? Nobody can expect but a small number of non-Jewish idealists to fight in comradeship with the Jews when the Jews, and the Jews only, are attacked. Anti-Semitic and non-anti-Semitic people seem jealously to watch lest the Jews should be able to defend themselves.

This is the reason why the Jewish problem, or rather the anti-Semitic problem, is embarrassing for all peoples concerned. It is most embarrassing for those gentle men and women who wholeheartedly want to help to create an ideal world, but who are too weak to cure whole communities of their Jew-madness. In democratic countries every rogue can choose to practice anti-Semitism, though it is dangerous to practice any other anti-social activity. Besides, every anti-Semite, at the very moment that he is undermining the freedom and peace of his country, has the impertinence to pretend to be patriotic.

Considering these difficulties, the question arises whether there is anything that could be done to relieve the world of this disease. Innumerable thinkers, politicians, and writers have discussed this subject. If men of good will study this problem from the anti-Semitic point of view, they will see that just as Jews cannot help being Jews, so the worst Jew-mad people cannot help themselves. It is necessary not only for the benefit of the Jews but also and chiefly of the non-Jews to find a cure for this disease. A study of the last 150 years of Jewish experience, a glimpse at the Inquisition in Spain before and after 1492, would be helpful therapy. A knowledge of the psychology and sociology of the anti-Semites would be very useful. It is doubtful whether the Hitler spirit would have almost conquered the world if he had not had the forces of his anti-Semitic International as faithful helpers everywhere, always. While the disease lingers, democracy is nowhere secure. Study will point the way to a solution.

Beginning of World Cooperation

JOHN A. LESTER

The atom bomb exploded fifty years too soon. In that hour we woke to find one chance of survival as civilized human beings: to build a cooperative world. But we were not yet accustomed to cooperative living —by fifty years. Now we must work swiftly to bridge the gulf in time. And the quickest and surest way to a cooperative world is to make cooperation normal and functional in our schools, to make it central to the experiences that mold the growing child. The road we take in the next fifteen years is to be determined finally not by scientists and politicians but within the hearts and minds of men.

If you put your finger on any shining example of cooperation among men in the past, you will have spotted a lack of something needed for satisfactory living. The Rochdale pioneers, in a blanket-making town, were shivering and hungry. The Swedes needed light bulbs at a price they could pay. The lobster fishermen of Nova Scotia needed twine for their bait nets, rope for their pot gengeons, their own lobster factories for their own catch. The farmers of the United States needed reliable fertilizers and cheaper gasoline.

But what brought into being the thirty odd cooperatives which have sprung up around Philadelphia, for example, in little more than a decade? Not one of these consumer cooperative food stores was founded because of the felt need of something not to be bought elsewhere. It was mainly a feeling among the organizers, sometimes a vague feeling, that they were doing something which could promote peace among men. How this incentive has been electrified now with an intense new meaning! The need for a rapid spread of cooperation has been spotlighted, and multiplied into cosmic dimensions. What is at stake is not oatmeal, pot buoys, electric bulbs—not the means of making a living. Life itself is at stake!

To see cooperatives at work among the young in the United States, you must go West. There, in typical American style, when students feel unsatisfied needs for food and shelter, they go out and get these things by cooperative self-help. For example, the University of California Cooperative has become the largest purchasing cooperative in the state. Now free of debt, with a sizable surplus, it plans for next year a million dollar building program of student housing and feeding.

The times call for a vast extension downward of this everyday experience of cooperative living at college—downward all the way to the first grade. Though I had known of some twenty thriving cooperatives in the schools of the eastern seaboard, it was a revelation to find, at a recent conference of representatives of Campus Cooperatives, that the most complete understanding of how a cooperative could become woven into the fabric of a school was shown by the students of an elementary school for colored children at Aberdeen, Virginia.

The college representatives were laboring the question of a paid manager, and the chairman asked the advisor if they paid their manager at Aberdeen. "No, ma'am, no one is paid anything in our co-op." "Who is your manager?" A bright little lad of twelve stood up. "I am." "Don't you have trouble getting help?" "No sir-r-e-e! My trouble is turning them away. Everybody wants to work in our co-op." The boy turned to me. "Sir, perhaps you would like to look through our scrapbook."

For the rest of that conference I was engrossed in that extraordinary document. It proved how a school cooperative may become the mainspring for a new way

of living, and at the same time a practical agency for much plain school learning. Facts become real to children when they are part of normal experience. Arithmetic becomes clear when children perform and check the money transactions in their own store. "Everyone in our grade," ran a second grader's entry in the scrapbook, "is now a member of the Aberdeen Co-op. We paid one dollar and ten cents today. Now we are members." Their names were added, and a certification from a second grade auditor: "I have added, and then I have multiplied."

Then, too, the first efforts at using language spring naturally from the relations of the child with his own school supply store. Here is a first grader's entry in the scrapbook, neatly printed out: "Now I own part of our store. Today I paid ten cents for one share, and now I can vote." Surely here is the first step toward the world citizen who will say, "I have given my pledges to a cooperative world. I own part of it, and I must help to direct its destinies." And it is a step that can be taken in every school where there are one or two teachers with the vision of that advisor from Aberdeen.

Kabir: The Apostle of Ecumenicity

HERBERT H. STROUP

In John P. Marquand's Pulitzer Prize novel, *The Late George Apley,* the author has George William Apley say at one point, "I am the sort of man I am, because environment prevented my being anything else." What Apley said for himself all people can say for themselves, for we are indeed products of the culture which has nourished us.

The study of the determination of personality traits by culture has been applied to many areas of human concern, but little has been done about the determination of religious beliefs and practices by the environmental influences which mold human beings from the cradle to the grave. Even as Gilbert and Sullivan said, though not applied to religion, each of us is born a "little conservative" or a "little liberal."

Since this is so, it is all the more surprising when a person is discovered who is able to transcend his natural heritage in the interests of larger and more inclusive loyalties. Such men do not frequent the human scene too often, yet their presence is fraught with nascent energy for the beliefs and actions of those with whom they associate. Kabir was such a person.

As with many characters of the past we know little of a definitive nature about the life of Kabir. Most authorities suggest that he was born in 1440 A. D. and that he died in 1518 A. D., but there are some who disagree, claiming that he was dead by 1449. For essential purposes the actual dates do not matter greatly.

Kabir was born in Benares, in the fountain source of Hinduism. It was there that he died. But within a lifetime he preached a doctrine which sought to unite all believers—Hindu, Jain, Buddhist, Moslem, and any others who would listen—into one integrated, religious movement. He was a precursor of that other great Indian eclectic in religion, Guru Nanak, the founder of Sikhism, the last of the world's great religions (aside from the secular religions). Kabir, in some ways, stood in relation to Nanak as John the Baptist stood in relation to Jesus. Kabir was a voice crying indeed in a wilderness of religious confusion, "Seek ye the way of the Lord." Recognizing that divinity must be a unity and that followership of such a divinity should be united, Kabir preached a doctrine of religious reconciliation.

Kabir's family provided a source for his message. His mother was a Hindu, carrying the traditions of that great religion. His father was a Moslem, maintaining with vigor the purity of the faith. Within this conflicting household the young Kabir rapidly grew. No wonder his attention was drawn to religion! If the Indian mentality was not natively interested in religious themes, this split-family situation would have created doubt and wonderment and synthesis.

Throughout his life, Kabir claimed to be a member of several religious groupings. He felt at home in Islam. He deeply felt for Hinduism. The "sancta" of both religions were part of his daily devotions. Yet, despite his affection for all religious forms, there was an element of revolt within Kabir as to taking such forms too seriously or exclusively. To him they were esthetic instruments, not final revelations. They were made for man, not man for them. Thus, he read both the Vedas and the Koran, but he denied that they were authoritatively inspired.

A man preaching a doctrine of religious eclecticism might well remain a dilettante esthete, withdrawn from the real world of religious antagonisms. That would have been a "normal" course for a man of the temperament of Kabir. But Kabir was bigger than that. He saw the need for at least two things. First, he did not merely accept the various religions with which he was acquainted as being equally valid. He went further than that. He sought to unite them. He sought to apply his eclecticism in a thoroughgoing fashion. He sought the one religion which finally might take the place of the many. Second, he accepted a followership. It is appropriate to say that he accepted this followership because there grew up about him those eager Indian minds who were searching for just such a message. When it was voiced they heeded the call. They clung to the Master through his lifetime and were instrumental in enlarging the group which agreed with his teachings.

At his death Kabir left a heritage which became the basis for later Sikhism. Sikhism, the most outstanding example of a concrete, historical effort to unify different major religions (and a religious dynamic to ponder in our day), is indebted not only to the fairly well-known Nanak but to the not-so-well-known Kabir—the Apostle of Ecumenicity.

Glorified Peace

Let peace be evermore
A symbol of man's pride!
For nations bound together
Let peace be glorified.

A shining light that leads
Man to benignant shrines,
Where no deep-dyed aggressor
Has laid his fell designs.

ANNE WILSON.

The Study Table

Unitarians on the March

TOGETHER WE ADVANCE. *Edited by Stephen H. Fritchman. Boston: The Beacon Press. 205 pp. $2.00.*

People within and without the Unitarian movement who often wonder just what are these Unitarians have in this collection a ready source for answering many of their questions. The clarity and the vigor with which the authors present their various materials give an accurate insight into the spirit of Unitarianism.

Taken as a whole the book is a dynamic and challenging presentation of the basic Unitarian position, and is descriptive of its organized functioning. From the first chapter, "On Being a Unitarian," by Stephen H. Fritchman, to the last chapter, "New Perspective," by Frederick Eliot there is a uniform quality of objectivity and enthusiasm which holds the interest and makes the work exceptionally readable.

Every phase of the cutting edge of the Unitarian movement is covered by those who are most closely connected with it. The wealth of information and experience of these writers give to this book an authority seldom equalled in Unitarian publications. Anyone curiously or already interested in the Unitarian movement should read this book.

The chapters and authors are:

1. On Being a Unitarian—Stephen H. Fritchman.
2. Lives Were Saved (Unitarian Service Committee)—Charles R. Joy and Edward A. Cahill.
3. These Things We Believe—E. Burdette Backus.
4. A Faith for Free Men—James Luther Adams.
5. Building a New World—Edwin B. Goodell, Jr.
6. Liberal Religion and the Sciences—Alfred Stiernotte.
7. Unitarians and the Christian Heritage—Herbert Hitchen.
8. The Unitarian Movement in North America—Henry Wilder Foote.
9. Unitarianism in Europe and Great Britain—John Howland Lathrop.
10. Unitarianism in Asia—Nym Wales.
11. Revolt in Education—Ernest W. Kuebler.
12. New Perspectives—Frederick May Eliot.

Also

Why I Became a Unitarian—Pierre van Paassen.
Unitarianism—What Is It?—A. Powell Davies.

RANDALL S. HILTON.

Things Eternal

IN SEARCH OF THE PERMANENT. *By Alexander A. Steinbach. New York: Wings Press. 160 pp. $2.00.*

Many of these twenty-four essays were written while the author, the Rabbi of Temple Ahavath Sholom in Brooklyn, New York, was chaplain at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma, and all of them disclose his keen insight into the soul of man as well as into the texture of the life that enfolds and claims us.

Rabbi Steinbach, whether he writes prose or poetry, is no neophyte before the Sphinx of Life, nor do the perplexities and confusions of existence hold any terror for him; he has learned how to get close to the "eternal strength of things" and "fearlessly to make strong songs of it," so that whatever he has to say partakes at once of the inspiration of prophecy and of the exaltation of beauty. Whether he writes of "Pain—Our Human Legacy," or of "The Music of Dawn," or of "Broken Strings," always he speaks as one who has looked intently at the face of truth, has seen there things ineffable and divine, and also found in that presence the courage and the imagination to speak in terms of music and faith.

Every so often the poet in him—and he is a poet of no mean proportions—rings in a bit of original verse, and not only is it always apropos, but also always touching and uplifting, e.g., in "Broken Strings",

> Sorrow must be forsaken,
> Released from the bondage of tears,
> And the flaming pulse of music
> Retrieved for the woes of our years.
>
> Heart, do not fail to remember,
> When sorrows are murmuring,
> That man is a sterile island
> When his spirit forgets how to sing.

In Search of the Permanent is a worthy counterpiece to Rabbi Steinbach's *Musings and Meditations* of several years ago, with possibly this difference, that in these later pieces his wisdom has gained in maturity, his style in clarity, and his beauty of imagery in mystical quality.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

From Genealogy to History

THE LOWELLS AND THEIR SEVEN WORLDS. *By Ferris Greenslet. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 442 pp. $4.00.*

This is one of the most important books published in the last twenty-five years. It is a timely reminder of the pit from whence the best in America "was digged." We need the book today, and all who put emphasis on patriotism and the desire to make America great should read and ponder it well. Here we have a history of a family, a genealogy. It is the most interesting way history can be written, and for America today the most important. The American Lowells began with Percival Lowle who settled in Newbury, Massachusetts, in 1639. Let it be noted that he did not come in the *Mayflower* nor was he among the earliest to arrive. The present reviewer has given considerable study to two families, both of whom settled in New England ten years earlier. The Hawley family in America began with General Joseph Hawley who settled at Stratford, Connecticut, in 1629, and the Dickinson family which began with Nathaniel who settled at Watertown, Massachusetts, likewise in 1629. Both these families paralleled the Lowells in producing clergymen, educators, writers; and it is worthy of note that Amy Lowell considered Emily Dickinson America's greatest poet and planned to write her biography. This is the way to write history and the way to appreciate and understand the making of America. But the Lowells stayed with few exceptions in Boston, and Ferris Greenslet, who knew those of his generation intimately, has shown with great impartiality their influence not only on Harvard, but also on business, the sciences and letters. He is cautious and guarded in praise and probably underestimates the work of James Russell Lowell as a writer and literary critic who, he thinks, "never wrote a book," merely publishing his essays, poems, and newspaper articles in ten volumes. Seemingly his favorite Lowell is Colonel Charles Russell Lowell, nephew of James Russell, hero of the Civil War who was killed in action at the Battle of Cedar Creek, Virginia, shortly before the end of the war. At the very hour he was killed, President Lincoln was signing his commission as Brigadier General. The

chapter telling of all this is by far the most moving of the entire book and reminds us that the Lowells were prophetic enough to see, long before others, the futility of war. Greenslet points out that both William McKinley and Rutherford B. Hayes served as officers in the same battle and both later became presidents. If only Lowell had survived, surmises Greenslet, he would have been a much abler president than either McKinley or Hayes. He, the fallen hero, had everything that would have made a great president. Percival Lowell is the next most interesting Lowell; as world traveler, he gave us our first understanding of Japan, and his writings excelled those of James. As astronomer he discovered the planet Pluto, and his work still goes on at the Lowell Observatory at Flagstaff. His sister Amy was not so retiring as Percival, and everybody heard about her poetry, her love for Keats, and her lectures. But, when all is said, Amy Lowell was the greatest poet in the Lowell line. Time fails to tell of all the others: clergymen who early became Unitarians, businessmen for whom the city of Lowell, Massachusetts, is named, lawyers, and President Lowell of Harvard University whose biography is being written by another. This is a great book. Put it at the top of your list and study it well.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Book Notes

THREE UNITARIAN PHILOSOPHIES. *By R. Lester Mondale. Boston: The Beacon Press. 31 pp. Twenty-five Cents.*

This little volume is a vivid and important statement by a strikingly successful pastor of the inclusive nature of the Unitarian household of faith. Deism, Theism, and Humanism are treated with sympathetic and penetrating understanding. The Unitarian movement, with all of its diversity, is white-hot with religious investigation—and it moves "toward something great," toward "global religion."

TOWARDS CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY. *By Sir Stafford Cripps. New York: Philosophical Library. 101 pp. $2.00.*

To Sir Stafford Cripps the Christian life is based on "belief in the common humanity of man inspired by the universal divinity of God"; and democracy is based on "the value and the importance of the human personality." Both become real when applied to our actions in relation to all the human beings who constitute society.

BEYOND DOUBT. *By Kenneth L. Patton. Boston: The Beacon Press. 184 pp. $2.00.*

Here is the book for which Humanists and other thoroughgoing religious liberals have been looking. It is a positive assertion of a human, natural, and scientific religious way of life. It is readable and inspiring, and can be easily understood by the average, serious-minded layman.

The author holds that doubt has done its work and that we must now move forward into a new religious climate in which modern men may feel at home. Great ideas and high hopes find a footing in a world of reality; and the earthy and meaty concerns of life are given artistic significance.

The problems that concern people who have been brought up in the old faiths are dealt with frankly and with understanding. And there is no doubt left as to what the author means when he says: "It is now time to go beyond doubt."

WHAT'S WRONG WITH RELIGION? *By Karl B. Justus. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc. 102 pp. $2.00.*

In which a thirty-three-year-old chaplain, who has had ten years of experience as a Protestant minister, records the broadening of his outlook. He believes that religion needs unity and he is committed to "One World" and "One Church."

PATHWAYS THROUGH THE BIBLE. *By Mortimer J. Cohen. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 548 pp. $3.00.*

This work is a successful effort to present the classic utterances of the Old Testament in the organized form that would likely be used by a modern writer, with a view to giving guidance to the general reader who often finds the Old Testament both difficult and uninteresting. The maps and illustrations are of high quality; and there is an excellent Table of Contents.

CURTIS W. REESE

The Plague

There's a contagion raging in the world—
The plague is epidemic and no land is clean.
It has many names, but this is what they mean—
That the germs have caught us—
And everybody
Everywhere
Breathes the air in which they are whirled.
War we call our disease, and want and destruction.
But it is the germs which destroy us, and they have other names.
And many who call themselves whole
Are rotten to the soul,
And walk about carrying the germs which eat up the world,
Like walking carriers spreading doom.
The microbes of our sickness are bigotry,
And religions that call themselves superior,
Thereby marking themselves as inferior;
And races that would put others beneath them,
Who hide their swords but will not sheathe them;
Hate that keeps men from calling any man brother;
And fullness that comes by taking something from another;
Wealth that feeds on poverty, monopoly babbling freedom,
Envy, fear, the wrong that is done to make a right,
Mistrust of the power of truth, with confidence only in might.
These are the bacteria which produce all our diseases.
Let me purge myself of their filth;
Let me find the prophylaxis to make me safe for the world,
And I shall do more to stop the plague
Than by killing off a million who are sick.

SHELDON SHEPARD.

Correspondence

W. I. L. at Luxembourg

To UNITY:

After World War I while the Peace Conference was in session at Paris, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom held a conference in Zurich. This year a similar circumstance took place, described in the report of the Tenth International Congress of the W.I.L.P.F., held at Luxembourg in August, as follows:

> Once again as at Zurich in 1919, the W.I.L. was holding its first post-war international gathering simultaneously with the assembling of the peace conference of the Powers at Paris. As in 1919, the Congress again sent a message to the statesmen, speaking for the countless men and women the world over who long for peace and the human rights that are inseparable from freedom.

Holding interest for everyone who is on the watch for signs of advance toward the world's ultimate goal of universal peace are the following high lights from this notable report of the W.I.L. Congress:

> One hundred and seventy delegates from fifteen countries assembled at the Palais Municipal, August 4th to 9th. . . .
>
> Many [delegates] had lived for six years in complete isolation, behind an iron curtain, with the illegal radio their only hold on sanity. They had breathed a poisonous atmosphere of lies, corruption, dehumanization of values and brute violence. . .
>
> Certain questions divided even those who had shared the common experience of Nazi occupation and oppression. . . . But over and over again as in 1919—in a world infinitely more complex than it was then—the will to understand one another and the desire to continue to work together prevailed. . .
>
> The discussions, however, showed a stronger emphasis on the fight against Fascism as a method of preventing war and a more passionate, burning interest in the rights of individuals, and the freedom of all peoples everywhere. . .
>
> We knew we could depend on one another, and we have not been disappointed. . .
>
> Emphasis was laid on organizing ourselves on a genuinely global basis. . .
>
> It is impossible to close without mentioning the greatest privilege the Luxembourg Congress yielded—that of meeting the truly remarkable and great personalities that from the beginning have been drawn into the work of the League.

The spirit of the conference is manifested in the words, "the will to understand one another and the desire to work together," a spirit which prevailed over all differences. Would that that spirit could prevail in all peace assemblies. I venture to predict that some of those notable women will be heard from within the next few years and that their viewpoints on "the rights of individuals and the freedom of peoples everywhere" will compel certain modifications in the policies now pursued by some of the world's leading nations.

LYDIA G. WENTWORTH.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

Harrington Replies to Editorial

To UNITY:

May I, as a "Socialist, pacifist," Unitarian, and complainant against the editor of *The Christian Register,* comment on your editorial "Freedom Unlimited." I seem to detect a basic confusion, if not contradiction, in Dr. Reese's thought. On the one hand he says that the one and only test of a Unitarian is the question, "Do you or do you not believe in interfering with the liberty of the brethren?" Unless one can say, "I do not," he is not a Unitarian. But then he proceeds to say, "Nor is it valid to say that liberty unlimited opens the door for the entrance of Jesuits, advocates of dictatorship, and avowed enemies of liberty . . . Liberty not only may but should protect itself from the intolerant." In other words, he would interfere with the liberty of the brethren to advocate dictatorship and the destruction of liberty, for then they have become one of the intolerant.

I prefer Dr. Reese's first test, and would apply no other. I would uphold the right of the brethren to advocate dictatorship. But I also insist on the right to criticize and condemn the brother when he does so. I insist on trying to protect liberty from the intolerant, not by means of suppression but by counter-propaganda and signals of alarm. Believe me, it is his first test, "Do you or do you not believe in interfering with the liberty of the brethren?" that the editor of *The Christian Register* could not pass.

I have complained against the editor of *The Christian Register* on these grounds:

1. He does not believe in freedom of speech for all, including the enemies of liberty. In two editorials in the *Register* in the last six months he has attacked the American Civil Liberties Union for upholding the right of the vicious Gerald L. K. Smith to speak and to be heard. Thus, in the *Register,* he has pressed his belief in interfering with the liberty of the brethren.

2. He is one of the intolerant. There is one point of view which he has consciously, consistently, and completely excluded from the *Register.* Articles, book reviews and letters critical of the social system and expansionist policies of the Soviet Union have been turned down. No really critical article about the Soviet Union can be found in the *Register* of the last few years. This writer had to protest four times to get a letter printed which was critical of the editor's interview with the Dean of Canterbury. An article describing Soviet activities in eastern Europe had all parts critical of Russia deleted before publication, without the author's permission. A commendatory review of Victor Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom* was refused (later printed by UNITY), and a derogatory review later accepted.

3. The editor of the *Register* is a leader in organizations controlled by "advocates of dictatorship" and "avowed enemies of liberty." This is his right. But he has given these organizations an excessive amount of publicity in *The Christian Register.*

I have not said, and do not now say, that liberty should protect itself from the intolerant by suppression and dismissal. I do maintain that it is the duty of the American Unitarian Association to maintain a free press, which it does not now have. It is the duty of those who love liberty to call attention to those in their midst who either openly or covertly advocate dictatorship and the destruction of democracy.

DONALD HARRINGTON.

New York City, N. Y.

"Obvious Confusion"

To UNITY:

As an occasional contributor to UNITY, I feel compelled to comment on the recent editorial entitled "Liberty Unlimited." I think it is an honest example of the obvious confusion facing Unitarians on the subject of Communists in liberal movements, both secular and religious.

The editorial itself is badly mislabeled. It begins bravely by demanding "no indecision on this issue . . . liberty [is] unlimited by external compulsions." Dr. Reese shakes a warning editorial finger at those who dare draw lines demarking the boundaries of liberty. Then he proceeds himself, however, to draw these lines when he says that "nor is it valid to say that liberty unlimited opens the door for the entrance of Jesuits, advocates of dictatorship, and avowed enemies of liberty and that such persons must be included as proper constituents of a free church." So liberty is limited after all!

Our democratic society has wisely given Communists, Socialists, New Dealers, Democrats, Republicans, American Actionists, American Fascists, Unitarians, Catholics and all other minorities the elemental freedoms of press, assembly, and speech *in society as a whole.* These freedoms must continue to remain unfettered. But that does not mean that any particular institution in society must give unlimited freedom to members of these voluntary minorities and cannot expose and, by democratic vote, oppose these minorities.

As to the treatment of Communists in our midst, one must determine whether they are, to use the valid yardstick of the UNITY editorial, "advocates of dictatorship and avowed enemies of liberty." Dr. Reese need not associate with Communists to know that they believe in the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and, more important, that American Communists, fellow travelers, and travelers' aid are avowed enemies of the liberties of certain groups in society (at this moment, of American Fascists).

I think Dr. Reese would perform a service by telling his readers why he has for many years been unwilling to sponsor meetings, groups, and movements believed to be dominated by Communists. For that is all some of us are asking, that the Unitarian denomination be unwilling to support officials dominated by Communism.

HOMER A. JACK.

Chicago, Illinois.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

MR. HILTON'S SCHEDULE

October 28—Jackson, Michigan.
November 3—Fort Wayne, Indiana.
November 7—Flint, Michigan.
November 17—Quincy, Illinois.
November 17—Keokuk, Iowa.
November 18—Quincy, Illinois.
November 23-24—Bloomington, Illinois.
November 25—Alton, Illinois.
November 29-30—Rockford, Illinois.
December 2—Geneva Board Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

TRAVEL FUND POLICY

We remind you of the policy of the Conference in regard to the Secretary's Travel Fund. A budgetary item is provided for this to enable the Secretary to accept all possible appointments. However, those churches that do pay the Secretary's expenses, an honorarium, or both, make a contribution to this Travel Fund. The increased cost in travelling makes these contributions exceptionally appreciated.

WANTED

If there is anyone reading this who has a copy of *Humanism,* by Curtis W. Reese, published by the Open Court in 1926, the Secretary would appreciate having the opportunity to purchase it. We can use several copies.

DR. LESLIE PENNINGTON

Friends of Dr. Leslie T. Pennington are sorry to learn of his illness. He recently underwent a respiratory operation and is making a very satisfactory recovery. At the present time he has a three-month leave of absence from the church.

HAROLD MARLEY SAYS:

"The minister looks at the faces in the congregation on Sunday morning and sees many kinds of people—various kinds of Unitarians, many who are anxious to hear about liberal religion. Some are new in the faith, all are serious minded and inquiring.

"There are those who demand a religion as scientific as the science which they practice in their daily work in the laboratory. Some are anxious for religious direction of the social problems, just now vexing and topheavy. Others want personal help for confusion within, a confusion which may be a result of the pressure of social events, or may have nothing to do with politics and economics.

"It is the responsibility of those who conduct the Service to be helpful to each and every one of these people. But it is an impossibility to be equally helpful every Sunday to everyone. Some Services are geared to certain problems about which a person may not be conscious. Perhaps he should be, and it may be that the Service will arouse him to an awareness. He may miss the very Service which would have done him the most good, or he may come late and fail to hear the thing on that day which would strike a responsive chord.

"It is a large order which is placed before the Sunday Service Committee each week, all to be filled in a single hour. But it is not an impossibility. If an old Unitarian learns a little more about his tradition; if a new Unitarian catches a glimpse of the responsibility which goes with freedom; if the visitor is impressed enough to come again, then the Service was not futile.

"No Unitarian Service is worthy of its name unless everyone present feels a new sense of his own dignity, and the inherent worth of man. Unless there is a rekindling of the inner fire and a direction given for the inspiration which rightly belongs to every human being, then the words were a violation of the semantics of true religion.

"The modern spirit of religion is trying to make intelligence as coercive as emotion, and the Ideal as reasonable as the lopsided actuality, which is mother to the Ideal."

ELIOT TOURS THE WEST

Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association, made a transcontinental tour during the month of November. He gave a series of four lectures as a part of the 75th anniversary celebration of the Denver Church, and after a flying trip to Portland, Oregon, stopped at the Twin Cities and Chicago. His trip began in Rochester, New York.

In Chicago Dr. Eliot addressed the All Unitarian Dinner at the First Unitarian Church on Thursday, November 21st. This was the annual fall dinner sponsored by the Chicago Associate Alliance. Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, President of the Chicago Associate Alliance, presided. Dr. Eliot gave a frank and clear presentation of the problems confronting Unitarians today, dealing particularly with that of freedom in the light of the current anti-liberal and red-baiting hysteria. The representatives of the churches present were greatly pleased and helped by his forthright talk and discussion of the questions.

Visitors from outside the Chicago area included Dr. Ralph E. Bailey of Milwaukee, and Judge and Mrs. James Wolfe of Salt Lake City.

CHICAGO UNITARIAN COUNCIL

At the All Unitarian dinner a brief business session was held by the Chicago Unitarian Council. The Nominating Committee submitted its report and the following officers were elected: President, Dr. Charles H. Lyttle; Secretary, Randall S. Hilton; and Treasurer, Mrs. Ralph Hicks. Mr. Arthur B. Hewson is the retiring President.

BOOKS

Elsewhere in this issue is a review of *Together We Advance,* edited by Stephen H. Fritchman. Copies are available at the Conference Office. Also we call to your attention *Strange Seed,* the latest volume of poems by Kenneth Patton. This too can be secured through the Conference Office, price $1.50.